

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on April 19, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully considered. A Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR §1.114 is filed herewith. Additionally attached to this Amendment is a Petition for a Two-month Extension of Time, extending the period for response to September 19, 2007.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for finding the time to talk with Applicants' Representative on July 25, 2007. The prior art cited was discussed with respect to claim 1, but agreement was not reached.

In this Response, Applicants have amended claim 1. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim, and claims 1-25 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over *Godwin et al.* (U.S. 6,505,192 B1) in view of *Yeager et al.* (U.S. 2003/0028585 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention improves over previous methods of searching Security Policy Databases for security policies by first dividing a Security Policy Database into a set of smaller Security Policy Databases, and searching through that set to locate the correct smaller Security Policy Database before searching again through that smaller Security Policy Database for a security policy. This can

be done faster than searching through the original, much larger, Security Policy Database for a security policy.

Independent claim 1 therefore recites “searching the peer table to locate a Security Policy Database within the set of peer-based Security Policy Databases by comparing the set of peer-based Security Policy Databases with the field of address of the peer table so as to obtain a corresponding peer-based Security Policy Database; and searching the corresponding peer-based Security Policy Database so as to obtain a security policy”.

In contrast, although *Godwin et al.* discloses having plural Security Policy Databases at different nodes, it merely teaches searching for a security association within a Security Policy Database, and does not disclose “searching the peer table to locate a Security Policy Database within the set of peer-based Security Policy Databases” as recited in claim 1.

Yeager et al. is relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly teaching building a peer table, albeit the peer table of *Yeager et al.* is different from that of the invention as previously discussed, but the Office Action does not allege that *Yeager et al.* remedies the above deficiency of *Godwin et al.*

As neither *Godwin et al.* nor *Yeager et al.*, whether taken separately or as a whole, provide any teaching or suggestion of the above-recited feature of claim 1, the presently claimed invention is non-obvious for at least this reason, and claims 1-25 are allowable.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should the remittance be accidentally missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

August 22, 2007
Date



Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP/pq